

To: Grantham, Nancy[Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov]; Hull, George[Hull.George@epa.gov]; Lemon, Mollie[Lemon.Mollie@epa.gov]
From: Smith, Paula
Sent: Thur 4/14/2016 9:47:18 PM
Subject: RE: URGENT: ACTION: Daily Caller; Bonita Peak Mining District HRS; DEADLINE 6 EST

Got no second request. Deb M. is working on question 2 and 3. Trying to get ahold of site assessment for #1.

- Paula

From: Grantham, Nancy
Sent: Thursday, April 14, 2016 3:36 PM
To: Smith, Paula <Smith.Paula@epa.gov>; Hull, George <Hull.George@epa.gov>; Lemon, Mollie <Lemon.Mollie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: URGENT: ACTION: Daily Caller; Bonita Peak Mining District HRS; DEADLINE 6 EST

Paula – do you have the second request the reporter sent?

Thanks ng

From: Smith, Paula
Sent: Thursday, April 14, 2016 5:30 PM
To: Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: URGENT: ACTION: Daily Caller; Bonita Peak Mining District HRS; DEADLINE 6 EST
Importance: High

Have been talking with Rob Parker to clarify answers below. Sent out urgent call for responses. Deb M in meeting until 4 our time.

- Paula

From: Smith, Paula
Sent: Thursday, April 14, 2016 3:27 PM
To: R8 GKM Leadership Team <R8_GKM_LeadershipTeam@epa.gov>
Cc: Wall, Dan <wall.dan@epa.gov>; McKean, Deborah <mckean.deborah@epa.gov>
Subject: URGENT: ACTION: Daily Caller; Bonita Peak Mining District HRS; DEADLINE 6 EST
Importance: High

Can you help with questions highlighted below? Urgent responses needed for reporter by 6 est.

- Paula

From: Parker, Robert
Sent: Thursday, April 14, 2016 1:55 PM
To: Murray, Bill <Murray.Bill@epa.gov>; Ketellapper, Victor <Ketellapper.Victor@epa.gov>; Miller, Johanna <Miller.Johanna@epa.gov>
Cc: Wendel, Jennifer <Wendel.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Peterson, Cynthia <Peterson.Cynthia@epa.gov>; Smith, Paula <Smith.Paula@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: ACTION: Daily Caller; Bonita Peak Mining District HRS; DEADLINE 5 pm today

Region 8 folks + Jennifer W –

I'm not sure who is taking the lead in responding to these questions, but I wanted to provide a few facts which might help respond to this general discussion. It seems the reporter believes the HRS package identifies EPA's priorities in regard to risk at the site. I want to be really clear that I don't view the Hazard Ranking System as a risk assessment, and I'm sure others would agree. It is a numerical screening model, prescribed by regulation, used to determine eligibility for the NPL.

Using the HRS, EPA assigns certain points for various types of receptors actually or potentially impacted by hazardous substances for each evaluated pathway. For the Bonita Peak site, EPA evaluated the surface water pathway and, using the HRS, documented the site is eligible to be included on the NPL based on the presence of fisheries and a threatened species relative to the observed releases of hazardous substances at the site.

EPA is aware that hazardous constituents have been and continue to release to fisheries within the watershed, but it is unknown at this point the risks to the human food chain. Additional data collection is required before risks to the human food chain are understood.

Rob

Rob Parker, P.E.

Site Assessment Manager

Environmental Engineer

US EPA, Region 8, Denver

(303) 312-6664

From: Ethan Barton [<mailto:ethan@dailycallernewsfoundation.org>]
Sent: Thursday, April 14, 2016 2:25 PM
To: Press <Press@epa.gov>; Lemon, Mollie <Lemon.Mollie@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Bonita Peak Mining District HRS

Here's the link to the HRS document, for your convenience:

<https://semspub.epa.gov/work/08/1769520.pdf>

On Thu, Apr 14, 2016 at 2:24 PM, Ethan Barton <ethan@dailycallernewsfoundation.org> wrote:

Hello,

I have some questions regarding the Bonita Peak Mining District HRS Documentation Record.

I would like to know why the drinking water threat was not scored. The document shows that ground water migration pathway was not scored because of the low population density and because there are "no municipal wells located within the four mile radius that serve as potable supplies."

However, Silverton, Colorado, Farmington, New Mexico, and the Navajo Nation have all had their water supplies affected by the Gold King Mine release, which suggests water supplies are, in fact, impacted by the Bonita Peak Mining District.

Additionally, both the human food chain and the environmental threats scored the max values. How is it that the EPA claims the river is safe for humans and that drinking water is not affected, yet the human food chain is heavily threatened?

Given the threat to the human food chain, have residents who live in the area who consume wildlife, such as fishers in Silverton, Colorado, been warned of this threat and been given guidance?

In sum:

1. Why was drinking water not assessed in the HRS, given the details provided?

Drinking water assessment not necessary to document that the site is eligible for the NPL.

2. How can the human food chain be so heavily threatened, but the drinking water, as well as the Animas River, is safe for humans?

3. Has the EPA warned local residents and provided guidance on the threat to the human

food chain?

My deadline is end of business today.

Thanks,

Ethan

--

Ethan Barton

Investigative Reporter

Daily Caller News Foundation

410-829-1738

@ethanrbarton

--

Ethan Barton

Investigative Reporter

Daily Caller News Foundation

410-829-1738

@ethanrbarton